REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative, Josh C. Snider, in the Telephone Interview conducted between the Examiner and Applicant's representative on May 29, 2007. Although agreement was not reached regarding the patentability of the claims in their present form, agreement was reached with respect to amendments to independent claim 22 that would place all of the pending claims in condition for allowance. The Examiner should find that claim 22 has been amended herein according to the agreement reached in the Interview.

The Examiner asserted in the Interview that the language of claim 22 was confusing the second to last paragraph of the claim. The second orientation control element appeared to be formed in the pixel electrode, but also on the substrate opposite the pixel electrode and partially outside the boundaries of the pixel electrode. Accordingly, claim 22 is amended herein to avoid this potential confusion.

The Examiner can see now that lines 6-7 of the claim more clearly define that the first orientation control element is formed in the pixel electrode, and the second to last paragraph has been amended to now define only how both of the first and second orientation control elements are pattern-cut slits. As agreed to in the Interview, these amendments will avoid any potential confusion as to the location of the second orientation control element. The first orientation control element is now more clearly featured to be formed in the pixel electrode, and the second orientation control element is now more clearly featured to be formed on the substrate opposite the substrate containing the pixel electrode.

As also discussed in the Interview, the Examiner requested that Applicant indicate the portion of the Specification that supports the limitation in clam 22 regarding how the second orientation control element is located on the substrate opposite the pixel electrode (such as the CF substrate), and is also parallel to the extending direction of the pixel edge. The Examiner can find clear support for these limitations in at least Figs. 21A-B of the present Specification, and the accompanying text to these drawings. Fig. 21A illustrates the slit pattern 44 being substantially parallel to the edge of the pixel electrode 15, and Fig. 21B illustrates how the slit pattern 44 is located on the CF substrate 12, which is opposite to the substrate 11 that contains the pixel electrode 15. (See also page 49, lines 14-24 of the present Specification).

Additionally, the Examiner will see that even though Fig. 21 is described with respect to the seventh embodiment of the present invention, the seventh embodiment is also based on the system shown with respect to the fourth embodiment (page 48, lines 13-15). Furthermore, the fourth embodiment is based on the system shown for the first embodiment of the present invention. (Page 33, lines 1-2 of the present Specification). Because the pattern-cutting features of the pending claims are primarily illustrated and described with respect to this first embodiment, the Examiner should see how such features are easily incorporated into at least the other embodiments that are based on this same first embodiment. The present Application therefore provides clear support for all of the recited features of independent claim 22 and its dependent claims.

For all of the foregoing reasons, and based upon the agreement reached in the Interview, Applicant submits that this Application, including claims 22, 26, and 34-35, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to again contact the undersigned attorney should he find that any further issues exist related to patentability.

> Respectfully submitted, GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

June 1, 2007

300 South Wacker Drive **Suite 2500** Chicago, Illinois 60606 Telephone: (312) 360-0080 (312) 360-9315 Facsimile:

P;\DOC\$\1117\68338\B21699.DOC